



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,882	10/23/2003	Robert M. Japp	END920000150US2	8999
30449	7590	05/03/2007		
SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS			EXAMINER	
22 CENTURY HILL DRIVE			NORDMEYER, PATRICIA L	
SUITE 302			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LATHAM, NY 12110			1772	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/691,882

Applicant(s)

JAPP ET AL.

Examiner

Patricia L. Nordmeyer

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-13, 17, 32, 34-37 and 40-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-13, 17, 32, 34-37 and 40-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Reopening of Prosecution

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on January 3, 2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing at the end of the Office action.

Withdrawn Rejections

2. Any rejections and or objections, made in the previous Office Action, and not repeated below, are hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2, 4, 5, 10, 17, 32 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatch et al. (USPN 4,929,370) in view of Weinreich (USPN 5,435,671) and Moline et al. (USPN 3,464,883).

Hatch et al. teach a structure comprising a stack comprising a plurality of sheets such that each successive sheet is coupled with a removable adhesive between each sheet and in direct mechanical contact with the successive sheets in each pair, and an opening extends through the plurality of sheets within the stack (Column 1, lines 10 – 25). The sheets may be selected from copper (Col. 4, lines 31-46). The removable adhesive is in the form of a semi-solid lubricant (Col. 5, lines 30-45). The adhesive layer helps produce smooth-walled drill holes, i.e., burr free holes (Col. 5, lines 37-40). The adhesive layer adheres to substrates in a semi-solid form (Col. 3, lines 55-62) and transfers to the drill bit at higher temperatures – i.e., the removable adhesive melts, thereby making it a liquid while adhesively coupling the successive sheets to each other, at operating conditions to provide lubrication for the drill bit (Col. 5, line 25 to Col. 6, line 35). The removable adhesive has a melting temperature of 60-65°F. Thus, it is implicit that the entire structure operates at temperature conditions within this range or above to facilitate melting of the adhesive and subsequent lubrication of the drill bit. Hatch et al. further teach the use of entry

Art Unit: 1772

and exit materials positioned on opposing sides of the stack of sheets (Fig. 3, #s 34 and 36). The entry and exit material for the sheets is typically some type of paper base or thin metal sheet such as aluminum (Col. 6, lines 54-56). Although Hatch et al. teach the use of an entry and exit material layer, Hatch et al. fail to teach the use of a burr preventing layer/ foil layer combination and the adhesive consisting of a liquid while adhesively coupling the successive sheets to each other.

Weinreich, however, teaches the use of a multilayered entry/exit board comprising a paperboard laminate impregnated with a lubricant and aluminum foil layer combination (see Fig. 1). Weinreich teaches the multilayered entry/exit board for the purpose of resisting burr-formation during drilling (Col. 2, lines 21-46).

Moline et al. teach adhesive consisting of a liquid while adhesively coupling the successive sheets to each other (Column 5, lines 22 – 26), wherein the sheets comprises metal foil (Column 4, line 8) for the purpose of having an adhesive without having excessive bleeding or oozing while having the desired amount of tackiness (Column 3, lines 30 – 38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to have modified Hatch et al. to include a multilayered entry/exit board as taught by Weinreich in order to resist burr-formation during drilling and to have substituted the semi-solid adhesive material in the Hatch et al. with a adhesive made from a

Art Unit: 1772

liquid as taught by Moline et al. in order to have an adhesive without having excessive bleeding or oozing while having the desired amount of tackiness.

With regards to the claim 17 limitation that there exists a plurality of stacks with intermediate burr-preventing layers, although Hatch et al. and Weinreich both fail to explicitly teach a multi-stack formation, modifying the aforementioned art to include a plurality of stacks would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 70. Here, the essential working parts of the invention are taught by Hatch et al. and Weinreich and one of ordinary skill in the art need only duplicate the base stack formation to be in accordance with the Applicant's claimed invention. Furthermore, the outermost aluminum layer in a stack as taught by Hatch et al. can serve as an intermediate layer as claimed by the applicant when in multiple stack formation.

5. Claims 3 and 41 – 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatch et al. (USPN 4,929,370) in view of Weinreich (USPN 5,435,671) and Moline et al. (USPN 3,464,883) as applied to claims 2, 4, 5, 10, 17, 32 and 40 above, and further in view of Sinclair et al. (USPN 5,834,582).

Art Unit: 1772

Hatch et al., Weinreich and Moline et al. teach the structure as described above.

However, the modified Hatch et al. fail to disclose the removable adhesive consisting of a material selected from the group consisting of water, water solution, fructose and sucrose.

Sinclair et al. teach an adhesive material made with sucrose material is removable and may be applied as a liquid (Column 24, lines 15 – 20; Column 55, lines 4 – 5) for the purpose of laminating layers together (Column 24, lines 43 – 44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have provided the sucrose adhesive material in the modified Hatch et al. in order to laminate layers together as taught by Sinclair et al.

6. Claims 6 – 9, 12, 13 and 34 – 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatch et al. (USPN 4,929,370) in view of Weinreich (USPN 5,435,671) and Moline et al. (USPN 3,464,883) as applied to claims 2, 4, 5, 10, 17, 32 and 40 above, and further in view of Frater (USPN 6,355,360).

Hatch et al., Weinreich and Moline et al. teach a structure as detailed above. The aforementioned prior art is silent with regards to the use of a three stainless steel plates on each side of the stack of metal substrates as well as a blotter pad within the three stainless steel plates. It is notoriously well known in the art, however, to provide at least three stainless plates in combination with a foil layer in the production of printed circuit boards as evidenced by Frater

Art Unit: 1772

(Col. 2, lines 53-64). These steel plates implicitly comprise pressure heads wherein a compressive force acts upon the entire substrate. Frater teaches that it is generally well known in the art to use multiple steel plates to prevent and minimize scrap and rework due to image transfer and surface quality problems (Col. 2, lines 53-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicants invention was made to have combined the teachings of Hatch et al., Weinreich, Moline et al. and Frater, since each of the aforementioned references are analogous insofar as being directed to improving the drilling operation in stacked metal formations.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to have modified Hatch et al., Weinreich and Moline et al. to include a three layered stainless steel configuration on each side of the foil layer lying adjacent the top and bottom of the stack of sheets as taught by Frater in order to prevent and minimize scrap and rework due to image transfer and surface quality problems. It further would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a paper (blotter) substrate between one of the steel plates since it is notoriously well known in the art to provide paper substrates in order to facilitate even application of pressure between opposing plates.

7. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatch et al. (USPN 4,929,370) in view of Weinreich (USPN 5,435,671) and Moline et al. (USPN 3,464,883) and Frater (USPN 6,355,360) as applied to claims 6 – 9, 12, 13 and 34 – 37 above, and further in view of Block (USPN 4,269,549).

Art Unit: 1772

Hatch et al., Weinreich, Moline et al. and Frater teach a structure as detailed above. Each of the aforementioned references detail the use of aluminum foil layer but fail to teach the use of a copper foil layer other than Hatch et al.'s disclosure of stacked copper substrates. It is notoriously well known in the art, however, that although aluminum is generally a preferred foil material, functionally equivalent foil materials including copper, magnesium, and steel may also be used as the foil sheets in entry/exit board formations as evidenced by Block (Col. 2, lines 5-11). Therefore, absent demonstration of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to have substituted the aluminum foil layer in the modified Hatch et al. with a functionally equivalent copper layer as taught by Block depending on the desired end product.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2 – 13, 17, 32, 34 – 37 and 40 - 43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to Applicant's argument with regard to the adhesive consisting of a liquid, please see the newly presented rejection in view of the Moline et al. reference above.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Nordmeyer whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Art Unit: 1772


1496. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 10:00-7:30 & alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Y. Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Patricia L. Nordmeyer
Examiner
Art Unit 1772

pln


RENA DYE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
Technology Center 1700